



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MW

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/423,698	02/10/2000	ODILE LEROY	99849-A	7060

7590 02/18/2004

MICHAEL S GREENFIELD
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

DUFFY, PATRICIA ANN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1645

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/423,698

Applicant(s)

LEROY, ODILE

Examiner

Patricia A. Duffy

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

The response and amendment filed October 23, 2003 has been entered into the record. Claims 1-24 are pending and under examination.

The text of Title 35 of the U.S. Code not reiterated herein can be found in the previous office action.

Rejections Withdrawn

The rejections of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention are withdrawn in view of Applicants amendments and comments.

Rejections Maintained

The rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu et al (Infection and Immunity, 40(1):245-256, April 1983) in view of Merck and Co. Inc. (EP 0497 525, May 8, 1992) is maintained for reasons made of record in the Office Action mailed 7-21-03.

Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness in view of the lack of motivation to combine the references. This is not persuasive, the rejection specifically articulated motivation to combine the references. Applicants argue that no conclusion that the lack of negative experiences was because two different protein carriers were used and that Chu et al do not provide any teaching why there was no negative effect. This is not persuasive, Chu et al do not have to teach why, the observation was in fact made that no negative effect was observed. Further, Applicants

Art Unit: 1645

are not arguing the rejection as combined, but their own motivation for combination. It is noted that the same motivation need not be articulated by the references, but a motivation must be articulated and was specifically articulated in the rejection. Chu et al need not necessarily be concerned with eliminating the negative interference associated with multivalent vaccines as argued by Applicants. The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. In *re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972) (discussed below); In *re Dillon*, 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991) (discussed below). Although *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300, 1302 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) states that obviousness cannot be established by combining references "without also providing evidence of the motivating force which would impel one skilled in the art to do what the patent applicant has done" (emphasis added), reading the quotation in context it is clear that while there must be motivation to make the claimed invention, there is no requirement that the prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention. Applicants argue that Chu et al do not teach what carriers are "useful". This is not persuasive, Chu et al teaches in context "useful" carriers are those useful or preferred in human use (page 254, column 1, first full paragraph) and Merck and Co. Inc et al teach that immune enhancer carrier proteins useful for treatment of humans include OMPC from *Neisseria meningitidis*, tetanus toxin and diptheria toxin. Moreover, the courts have held in *In re Kirkhoven* (205 USPQ 1069, CCPA 1980) that "It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form third composition that is to be used for the very same purpose: idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." and as such, the addition of the Merck and Co. Inc. composition to that of Chu et al is *prima facie* obvious.

Art Unit: 1645

For the foregoing reasons the rejection is maintained.

Status of Claims

All claims stand rejected.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia A. Duffy whose telephone number is 571-272-0855. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30 pm - 3:00 pm. If attempts to

Art Unit: 1645

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Smith Lynette can be reached on 571-272-0864.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Patricia A. Duffy

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1645